



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/591,899	06/12/2000	Neil T. Parkin	59597-A/JPW/JML/CMR	3775

7590

12/03/2002

John P White Esq
Cooper & Dunham LLP
1185 Ave of the Americas
New York, NY 10036

EXAMINER

FOLEY, SHANON A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1648

DATE MAILED: 12/03/2002

13

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/591,899

Applicant(s)

PARKIN ET AL.

Examiner

Shanon Foley

Art Unit

1648

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 October 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-79 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 13-79 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 9 and 12.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 1648

DETAILED ACTION

In paper no. 11, applicant amended claims 1, 4, 7 and 10. Claims 1-79 are pending. Claims 13-79 are withdrawn from consideration due to a non-elected invention and claims 1-12 are under consideration.

Double Patenting

Claims 1-12 of this application conflict with claims 1-12 of Application No. 09/663458. 37 CFR 1.78(b) provides that when two or more applications filed by the same applicant contain conflicting claims, elimination of such claims from all but one application may be required in the absence of good and sufficient reason for their retention during pendency in more than one application. Applicant is required to either cancel the conflicting claims from all but one application or maintain a clear line of demarcation between the applications. See MPEP § 822.

A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer cannot overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

Claims 1-12 are provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1-12 of copending Application No. 09/663458. This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Art Unit: 1648

Applicant notes that only claims 1-12 are under consideration in the instant case and will consider canceling co-pending claims in each application once allowable subject matter is indicated.

Applicant's observation regarding the pending claims is correct. The previous Office action appears to have had typòs by including claims 13-79 of the instant application in the rejection. The examiner apologizes for any inconvenience this caused applicant. However, the rejection of claims 1-12 remain rejected for reasons of record.

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-12 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 98-112 and 114-117 of copending Application No. 09/766344 in view of Patick et al. (Antimicrobial Agents and Chemotherapy. 1998; 42 (10): 2637-2644) for reasons of record.

Applicant argues that a prima facie obvious case has not been established because neither reference teaches the mutations recited in the instant claims. Applicant also asserts that Patick et al. teaches that mutations at codons 63, 10, and/or 20 in combination with a mutation at codon 82

Art Unit: 1648

does not change sensitivity to indinavir, while the instant application teaches that these mutations denote a decrease in susceptibility to indinavir.

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered, but are found unpersuasive. It is not evident where applicant has found this teaching in Patick et al. and appears to be arguing a limitation that is not present in the claims, i.e. codon 82. The claims are drawn to assessing whether a patient's sample comprises a mutation at codon 88 and in conjunction with other mutations. As indicated in the previous Office action, the application does not teach specific codon mutations. However, Patick et al. does. Further, Patick et al. specifically teaches that a mutation present at codons 88 and 46 demonstrated a decrease in susceptibility to nelfinavir, see Figure 3 on page 2640 and the paragraph bridging pages 2639-2640. Therefore, it is maintained that the invention as a whole would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Patick et al. supra for reasons of record.

Applicant argues that Patick et al. fails to teach specific mutations recited in the claims and does not anticipate the instant invention.

Art Unit: 1648

Applicant's arguments, as well as a careful review of the reference has been considered, but is found unpersuasive. The claims are drawn to a method of assessing the effectiveness of a specific retroviral therapy by collecting a biological sample from a patient and evaluating whether the sample comprises a mutation at codons 88 and/or 63, 77, 46, 10, 20, 36. Therefore, the method is required to collect a biological sample and determine whether a mutation exists in codon 88. Since the other codons are listed in alternative form in the claim, only one more mutation in addition to codon 88 is required to anticipate the reference.

Patick et al. teaches collecting a plasma sample from HIV-infected individuals and evaluating whether or not specific mutations at codons 88 to serine, 77 to isoleucine, 46 to isoleucine, and 36 to isoleucine result in a decrease in susceptibility to nelfinavir, see Figure 1 on page 2638 and Figure 3 on page 2640. Although Patick et al. does not teach an increase in susceptibility to amprenavir, this characteristic would be an inherent property since the structural mutations at the required residues are present. Therefore, the teachings of Patick et al. anticipate the instant invention.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37


Art Unit: 1648

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shanon Foley whose telephone number is (703) 308-3983. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Housel can be reached on (703) 308-4027. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-4242 for regular communications and (703) 308-4426 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.


Shanon Foley
November 29, 2002


MARY E. MOSHER
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 1800 1600